

Project Closeout Report

Presented to the IT Committee October 14, 2010

Project Name: Broadband Mapping

Agency: Information Technology Department

Business Unit/Program Area: Telecommunications

Project Sponsor: Duane Schell

Project Manager: Dirk Huggett

Objectives		
Project Objectives	Measurements	
	Met/ Not Met	Description
<u>Objective 1:</u> Collect and store required data that meets Federal requirements	Met	<u>Measurement:</u> 80% of the providers will provide broadband availability data
<u>Objective 2:</u> Provide the public access to the data via a web interface	Not Met	<u>Measurement 1:</u> A web application to access this data is available on the state infrastructure to the citizens (Y/N)
	Not Met	<u>Measurement 2:</u> Any citizen can access 100% of the data within the limits of non-disclosure agreements
<u>Objective 3:</u> Model data to align with GIS standards	Met	<u>Measurement 1:</u> Data is available by address with a 75% coverage
	Met	<u>Measurement 2:</u> Data is available by provider
	Met	<u>Measurement 3:</u> Data is available by service area
<u>Objective 4:</u> Make the data available in the state GIS infrastructure	Met	<u>Measurement 1:</u> Data provided passes 100% of the functional tests to move onto state servers (Y/N)
	Met	<u>Measurement 2:</u> Data can be accessed by standard state toolsets (Y/N)
<u>Objective 5:</u> Provide ability to update data on a regular basis	TBD*	<u>Measurement:</u> There is a toolset to allow providers to update information (Y/N) <u>Measurement:</u> There is a process in place to notify the providers to update the data, how to use the provided toolset, a communications plan to encourage updates, and how to perform the actual update to the data & models.
<u>Objective 6:</u> Provide NTIA with required data	Met	<u>Measurement:</u> Data meets Federal requirements and NTIA accepts upload (Y/N)

* The actual success of the designed process to update the data won't be measured until 2011

Due to concern expressed by the providers about the coverage shown on the map (which was based upon the data they provided) the team decided to close the project without meeting Objective #2. The site is in the production environment, we have provided the link to the site to NTIA as required, but we have not released the link to anybody else.

Schedule Objectives					
Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Final Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Actual Schedule (in Months)	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Met	8	8	8	8 days (5%) Behind	8 days (5%) Behind

Budget Objectives					
Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Budget	Final Baseline Budget	Actual Costs	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Met	\$782,951	\$796,151	\$779,266	\$3,685 (0.5%) Under	\$16,885 (2.1%) Under
The project had two changes that impacted cost. Both were due to NTIA changes in requirements. See the table below. Final CPI = 1.02					

Project Closeout Report

Presented to the IT Committee October 14, 2010

Major Scope Changes				
Request #	Date of Request	Description	Area of Impact (C,S,S,Q)	Status
1	1/25/2010	Replace TeleTrace Routing with Speed Test & Route Wireless	Scope, Quality	Accept
2	1/25/2010	Remove Draft NTIA deliverables from scope	Scope, Cost, Schedule	Reject
3	1/25/2010	Add Survey staff member to project	none	Accept
4	4/12/2010	Split Task 8b into two payments	none	Accept
5	5/20/2010	Extend the data deliverable (Task 5) currently scheduled for July by 1 month. This would not add another delivery, just extend the time period for delivery.	All	Reject
6	7/14/2010	NTIA Data Format changes	Schedule, possibly cost	Accept Option B
7	7/14/2010	Start Spring maintenance early	Schedule, Cost	Reject
8	8/26/2010	Change to Census 2000 Geography	Scope, Cost	Accept

Above is a list of all Changes and areas of impact that occurred in the project. Note: the first three changes occurred in the planning stages and reflect changes to the contract.

Lessons Learned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the best accuracy, a map of the census blocks should be given to the providers. It would make it easier for them to accurately identify coverage areas. Different color codes could be used to indicate different types of service. Bringing the private sector into the ESC worked well. We were able to have a direct channel to many of the providers and he helped us address possible concerns prior to becoming an issue. The public release of a site, not just having it in production, should be a specific task in the project plan. We should have followed-up more closely with the vendor to understand what information the providers were given back after their submissions to avoid having the significant errors we ended up with regarding how the data they provided showed their coverage. We thought our original plan to provide the first level data to NTIA in September would be accepted by NTIA. This turned out to be a false assumption. We had to provide data in April and in June. The project was not planned that way, and while we were able to meet those dates without significant impact to schedule and budget, I would have to say that it probably did impact quality. Specifically, I think the original plan would have provided more time for feedback to the providers.

Success Stories
<p>We were able to successfully meet 4 of our 6 business objectives. (One objective won't be measured until 2011 and one was unmet.) We have met all Federal requirements of the program to this point. I believe the progress and success of our project helped our case for the supplemental funding we received for the program.</p>